REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. No claims have been canceled or added in this reply. Claim 1 is amended. Hence, Claims 1-11 and 13-14 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed December 16, 2008 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-11 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Miida*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049839, in view of *Dunmore et al.* (U.S. 7,302,444). (Office Action, page 3) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for processing network device status data and recites:

"a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration data indicates both:
  a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices,
       wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices, and
  how to convert network device status data, **received from a network device,** that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices;
a conversion mechanism configured to
  process the network device status data that conforms to the first data format, and
  generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, wherein **the network device status data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device.**"

Support for the amendment is provided at least in paragraphs [0008] and [0024] of the specification.

Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not taught or suggested in *Miida* and *Dunmore,* individually or in combination. For example, *Miida* and *Dunmore,* individually or in

combination, fail to teach or suggest "**generate, based upon configuration data and the network device status data, report data [...], wherein the network device status data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device.**"

The approach recited in Claim 1 provides many advantages, especially in networks containing devices from various manufacturers and serviced by various vendors. For example, as described in applicants' specification paragraphs [0005], [0030] and [0038], if the network device status data uniquely identifies an intended recipient of the device's report, the network device can communicate its report directly to the device's manufacturer or vendor that specializes in servicing the particular network device. This can be especially beneficial in networks that comprise devices serviced by a number of various vendors, and where matching the device status data with the correct vendor is cumbersome, unless the "network device status data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed.

MIIDA REFERENCE

In *Miida*, a computer center collects and analyses information from copiers, and selects a user to whom the collected information is provided; however, the information collected from *Miida's* copier does not "uniquely identify an intended recipient device," as claimed. As depicted in *Miida's* FIG. 1, the center collects information from the transmission devices 400-1 to 400-n, and provides reports containing collected information to the terminals 500-1 to 500-n. (Miida, paragraph [0139]) Each of the terminals 500 may be a personal computer. (Miida, paragraph [0156]) Each of the terminals may be accessed by an individual who is registered with the center. (Miida, paragraph [0156]) However, in *Miida*, neither the collected information nor the transmission device has knowledge about who the registered users are. Therefore, the information collected from the transmission devices 400 cannot "include identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed.

In *Miida*, the authorized recipients are registered with the center, not uniquely identified by the "network device status data, received from a network device," as claimed. In *Miida*, to access a report data, a user has to send customer-identification information to the

center 100, and the center 100 has to verify whether the user is registered with the customer-ID database 22. (Miida, paragraph [0181]) However, *Miida's* copiers themselves have no reason to know user's IDs. Therefore, in *Miida*, the "network device status data" does not include "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed.

In *Miida*, any user who has been successfully authorized with the center, may receive a particular report from the center, and *Miida's* **center does not determine whether the recipient has been "uniquely identified as an intended recipient" by the "identification data" in the "network device status data," as claimed.** In *Miida*, after the user sends to the center its ID information, the center accesses the customer-information database 22, and based on the user's ID information determines which copiers' reports may be accessed by the particular user. (Midda, paragraph [0184]) Then the center retrieves the particular report data from the center's database (Midda, paragraph [0184]), and allows the particular user to access the report via a website, and/or emails the report to the user (Miida, paragraph [0253]). However, *Miida's* network device status data itself does not identify the recipient, and does not include "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed.

DUNMORE REFERENCE

In *Dunmore*, a user requests the data from the database, and defines the format in which the queried data should be provided; however, the queried data does not include "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed. *Dunmore* describes a method and system for designing report templates that can be used to output report data. (Dunmore: Col. 5, ll. 38-41) When the user wishes to actually run the report, the user provides a user report request to a report generator. (Dunmore: Col. 5, ll. 56-58) Then, the report generator queries the database system, executes a query against the database and outputs the query results in the format specified by the user's template. (Dunmore: col. 5, ll. 56-63) However, *Dunmore's* data in the database does not include "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 recites one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida* and *Dunmore*, individually or in combination. Therefore, *Midda* and *Dunmore*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the whole subject matter recited in Claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 2-6, 8-11 AND 14

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that *Miida* and *Dunmore*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggests Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore* and in further view of *Krishnaprasad et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099687 (hereinafter "*Krishnaprasad*"). It is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida* and *Krishnaprasad* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida* and *Dunmore*. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *Krishnaprasad* and it is understood that the *Krishnaprasad* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 7 relating the XML schema conversion.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida, Dunmore* and *Krishnaprasad*.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore*, and further in view of *McGlade*, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,598. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida, Dunmore* and *McGlade*, considered alone or in combination, for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida* and *Dunmore*, individually or in combination.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *McGlade* and it is understood that the *McGlade* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 13 relating to providing a notification if a receipt confirmation indicating receipt of the report data is not received from a particular recipient device.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida, Dunmore* and *McGlade*.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional fees, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: March 3, 2009

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Telephone:(408) 414-1228
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

49986-0536 (RSID 1-432)   9